CANUCK LAW
Reporting That You're Not Getting Elsewhere (Do Your Own Research To Verify)

SEPTEMBER 8, 2022 BY RONNIE

O.H.R.T./O.C.T. Okay Pushing Gender Ideology On Young Children

CanLII
Home › Ontario › Human Rights Tribunal of Ontario › 2022 HRTO 1044 (CanLII)
Find in document
N.B v. Ottawa-Carleton District School Board, 2022 HRTO 1044 (CanLII)
Document
History (1)
Cited documents (24)
Treatment (0)
CanLII Connects (0)
Date: 2022-08-25
File number: 2019-36437-I
Citation: N.B v. Ottawa-Carleton District School Board, 2022 HRTO 1044 (CanLII), <https://canlii.ca/t/jrnlk>, retrieved on 2022
lexbox
Save this case
Set up citation alert
Email this case
Browse Lexbox
HUMAN RIGHTS TRIBUNAL OF ONTARIO
BETWEEN:
N.B, as represented by her Litigation Guardian P.B.

A recent ruling from the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal has found that pushing gender ideology on children as young as 6 doesn't amount to a violation of their rights.

It was also mentioned in the ruling that a complaint was filed with the O.C.T., who saw no issues in terms of professional standards of practice.

In some sense, this shouldn't be a surprise. Considering that "human rights" now involve perpetuating this. Curiously, had the teacher said that there are only boys and girls, the H.R.T. would likely have taken that much more seriously.

Here are the events as described in the decision:

> [16] P.B. described that in March 2018, on a Saturday morning at the breakfast table, when the family was having a conversation about family roles, ***N.B. told her parents that there were no such things as boys and girls.*** In response to her father's statement that when she grew up she could be a mother, N.B. apparently said to her parents that she did not want to be a "mommy" when she grew up, and she wanted a dog instead. ***She apparently also told her parents that she knew that you can go to a doctor to change your body, if you don't want to have a baby***.

> [17] In response to her parents' query about these statements, N.B. told her parents that the ***statement about boys and girls, as well as about the role of a doctor in changing a person's body was apparently made in her Grade 1 classroom in January***, although N.B. did not mention it to her parents until March 2018.

> [18] Also in March 2018, N.B. allegedly told her father on the way home from school one day that ***her teacher had said at some point that "there was no difference between boys and girls" and further that "boys can be girls and girls can be boys"***.

> [19] These statements regarding boys and girls, as cited by N.B.'s father J.B., as well as some of N.B.'s follow up comments about gender issues, ***coupled with her drawing of a gender spectrum on the white board in her bedroom***, allegedly concerned P.B. sufficiently that she decided to "look into the matter and take some follow up action".

Forget the "human rights" element for a moment. This shouldn't be taught in schools at all, let alone to children who are barely out of kindergarten.

The document goes on a length about consistencies in the witnesses' memories. However, this is beside the point, as the H.R.T. most likely would have thrown the case out regardless of how certain everyone was on their facts.

(Paragraph 105) The students are exposed to gender-spectrum-drawings, which was supposedly shocking and distressing by iteself.

(Paragraph 112) It was also admitted that complaints had been filed with the O.C.T., or Ontario College of Teachers. However, they were dismissed since none of this amounted to a failure of professional standards.

(Paragraph 133) the H.R.T. seems to play dumb with the claims of “cultural colonization” and a way of “reprogramming a child’s identity”. Apparently, confusing children doesn’t amount to violating their human rights in any way.

(Paragraph 139) There’s apparently a Gender Identity and Gender Expression Guide to Support Our Students. This document is based upon the Code, as well as the Human Rights Commission’s “Policy on preventing discrimination because of gender identity and gender expression”. In other words, the so-called human rights were used as a justification to push gender ideology in the first place.

(Paragraph 143) The Grade 1 teacher admits that there is the motivation of acceptance, in not teaching that there are in fact real differences between boys and girls.

The decision goes on at length about how “gender expression” is now entrenched as a human right. Interestingly, girls and boys who are content with reality are forced to put up with such things. There’s no right to be protected from this ideology.

Throughout the ruling — and likely many others — physical and biological reality is substituted for “identity”, and for “expression”. Genuine truths don’t seem to matter if someone gets offended over this.

Ultimately, the case was thrown out. Pushing gender fluidity on young children wasn’t against the Human Rights Code. Apparently, it doesn’t go against the College of Teachers’ professional standards either.

Incidents like that are why more and more parents are looking at homeschooling.

(1) https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onhrt/doc/2022/2022hrto1044/2022hrto1044.html
(2) https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onhrt/doc/2022/2022hrto1044/2022hrto1044.pdf

CANADA, CANADIAN DECISIONS, EDUCATION, HUMAN RIGHTS, LGBTQ